

# Shakespeariana


VOL. V.

OCTOBER, 1888.

NO. LVIII.

## *HOW DID YOU BECOME A SHAKESPEARE STUDENT?*

### PART I.

N answer to the leading question, "How did you become a Shakespeare student?" the accompanying letters have been received. This question is not a matter of idle gossip. Its interest turns upon that characteristic quality belonging only to genius, and above all to the genius of Shakespeare—the call it makes upon the life-long devotion of the various minds it especially attracts. Its natural election of its peculiar lovers is mysterious, the destined ways of its strong mort-main past the finding out of the idly curious. The workings of its fascinating influence under different conditions are implied rather than expressed in the autobiographic replies the question has called forth. It is with no idea of adding to the stock of more and less impertinent personal talk in which it is the fashion to indulge, that these letters are recorded here, but rather to give place to a body of experiential evidence carrying with it a significant witness and tribute to the lovable greatness of Shakespeare.

#### MR. J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS'S LETTER.

"To the best of my recollection Shakespeare fascinated me in very early life chiefly if not entirely by the unrivalled melody of his versification, and even now, so far as the effect in mere reading is concerned, my temperament is more distinctly affected

by that melody than by the grander results of his genius. It was not until I had witnessed the exquisite impersonations of Miss Helen Faucit that I had the least appreciation of his dramatic art. They have dwelt in my memory ever since, witnesses in themselves sufficient for the conviction that no satisfactory high general criticism on his dramas is possible without the assistance of stage interpretation. Then, having a great fancy for record research, I have devoted the larger portion of forty years, 1847 to 1887, to the evidential study of the poet's biography. And this is all that is in my power to say in reply to your enquiry. Believe me

Yours faithfully,

J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS."

DR. H. H. FURNESS'S LETTER.

"I became a 'Shakespearian,' if that phrase is to be used, in the same way in which we are all 'Shakespearians': by being born to the inheritance of the finest dramas in the finest literature of the world. To seize this inheritance and to be initiated into this select circle, one needs, in this country at least, merely to learn to read. This boundary passed, and Shakespeare is ours to the full extent of all our powers, capacities, talents, wisdom, learning. He will charm us in childhood, fascinate us in youth, and, to the last limits of life, whatever be the lessons which the world, with its joys and its sorrows, may teach us, we shall still find that Shakespeare has anticipated them all. There are no heights or depths of the human soul which Shakespeare has not reached or fathomed, and no length of days yet given to man has proved his wisdom shallow.

"Thus are we all 'Shakespearians,' and I suppose that there is scarcely a breather of this English air that would not deem that lot enviable which, with a jocund mind, could be devoted to reading, and pondering, and studying these immortal revelations of the human soul, called Shakespeare's Dramas.

"But you have asked me a personal question, and must not therefore think me unmannerly if I assume the odious role of an egotist.

"I cannot but think that I have been peculiarly favored in my intro-

duction to Shakespeare. When I was about fourteen or fifteen years old, during two winters between 1847 and 1849, Mrs. Kemble gave, here in Philadelphia, two series of Readings, and to both of them, with infinite kindness she sent me a card of admission. Thus to this gracious lady and venerated friend I owe the memory, vivid to this hour in many a scene and line, of her inimitable revelations of more than half of all of Shakespeare's plays. 'O precious evenings!' says Longfellow of these Readings, in one of his finest Sonnets:—

'O precious evenings! all too swiftly sped!  
Leaving us heirs to amplest heritages  
Of all the best thoughts of the greatest sages  
And giving tongues unto the silent dead!  
How our hearts glowed and trembled as she read,  
Interpreting by tones the wondrous pages  
Of the great poet who foreruns the ages,  
Anticipating all that shall be said!  
O happy Reader! having for thy text  
The magic book, whose sibylline leaves have caught  
The rarest essence of all human thought!  
O happy Poet! by no critic vex!  
How must thy listening spirit now rejoice  
To be interpreted by such a voice!"

"In 1858 or 1859 I joined The Philadelphia Shakspeare Society, which, now in the thirty-seventh year of its existence, is believed to be the oldest society in the world devoted to the study of Shakespeare. It is not worth while to give an account at length of this Society; a history of it is now preparing by Richard L. Ashhurst, esq., one of the best Shakespearian scholars I know of, and it will be subject for notice in your pages when it is printed. In the present egotistical mood into which you have forced me, it may be noted that the idea of a New Variorum edition of Shakespeare grew directly out of our needs in this Society. Every member had a copy of the Variorum of 1821, which we fondly believed had gathered under each play all Shakespearian lore worth preserving down to that date. What had been added since that year was scattered in many different editions, and in numberless volumes dispersed over the whole domain of literature. To gather these stray items of criticism was real toil, real but neces-

sary if we did not wish our labour over the text to be in vain. It constantly happened,—remember it was before the days of Booth's 'Reprint,' Staunton's 'Photolithograph,' Ashbee's Facsimiles of the Quartos, or of the Cambridge Shakespeare,—it constantly happened that we spent a whole evening over a difficult passage (and as we were all members of the Bar they were battles royal) only to find that the whole question had been discussed and settled by learned men elsewhere. Hence it dawned on us that if we were to pursue our studies with any of the ardor of original research we should exactly know all that had been said or suggested by our predecessors. It was nigh fifty years since the publication of the last Variorum and the time seemed ripe for a new one.

"*Argal*, in the fullness of time, and with terrible tremblings and misgivings, appeared '*Romeo and Juliet*.'

"'Are you answered?'

"HORACE HOWARD FURNESS."

DR. W. J. ROLFE'S LETTER.

"'Story, God bless you! I have none to tell, sir!' as the 'Needy Knife-Grinder' says; but if anybody cares to know how I became a student of Shakespeare, and how it happened that I ventured to prepare an edition of the dramatist, the questions are easily answered.

"My love for poetry dates back to my earliest boyhood. There were few books in the household library, but among them was an old copy of Dodd's '*Beauties of Shakespeare*,' which had a peculiar fascination for me. Many of the shorter extracts in it fastened themselves in my memory, and I know I liked them better than good Dr. Watts's hymns, many of which I conned and learned by rote to while away the tediousness of the forenoon and afternoon services at church—that is, when I was not pondering upon an arithmetical problem which never ceased to perplex me, namely, why these services, which, measured by the clock, were only about half as long as the week-day sessions at school, should always seem more than twice the length of those. I should have much preferred the Dodd to the old "*Watts and Select*" hymnal, but knew better than to attempt to smuggle that or any other '*profane*' literature into the Sunday prison-house.

"Later I was keenly interested in the extracts from Shakespeare—like the tent-scene in *Julius Cæsar*—in the reading-book we used in the grammar-school; and when I had reached the high-school a more advanced 'reader' and Lovell's 'United States Speaker' furnished a few more selections from the same source, which shared my affections with Milton's *Lycidas*—the only other poetry which I recollect particularly enjoying at that time. If I had the old books to look over as I write, I should very likely recognize other pieces of verse that were my favorites.

"When I first read an entire play of Shakespeare I cannot say, nor do I remember that I made any study of the poet until I began to teach in a small country academy just after leaving college. The critical study of English literature was then quite unknown in our schools. Those were the days when the young woman who had 'finished her education' at high-school or academy used to boast that she had 'parsed through' Milton's *Paradise Lost*. That the poem had any other use or interest than to be 'parsed,' or that Milton had any purpose in writing it except to furnish material for this stupifying and stultifying exercise (curses on the man that invented it!) never entered her head. I myself taught grammar after the fashion of the time, and 'parsing' withal, but blundered into something more rationable and enjoyable as a mere recreation in the routine of everyday work. I got into the way of talking with my pupils about the poetry in the reading-book as *poetry*; and the interest this exercise aroused led to the reading and familiar discussion of such other specimens of standard poetry as my own small library and the limited stock of good literature in the village could supply. The only *Shakespeare* I had was Moxon's one-volume edition, without notes; but of this I made such use as was possible when the teacher knew scarcely more of Elizabethan English than some of the brightest among his pupils.

"Two years later, when I became the master of a high-school just established in a town near Boston, and had to arrange the English and classical courses for it, I made this study of English a prominent feature in both departments. So far as I could learn, there was only one other high-school in Massachusetts—that at Cambridge, where

Mr. Elbridge Smith was master, and Professor (afterwards President) Felton and Edward Everett were members of the School Committee—in which any such work was done. When I sent my first class to Harvard in 1856, the four boys (who entered ‘without conditions’) had had as thorough training in English as in Greek and Latin, though no examination in our own language and literature was then required for admission to the university. One of those boys, Henry A. Clapp, has lately made his mark as a lecturer on Shakespeare in Boston and its vicinity, and is sure to win in due time a national reputation as a keen and sympathetic critic and eloquent interpreter of the dramatist. He learned little or nothing of Shakespeare from me, as we had not then made any systematic study of his works in the school, but our readings in other of our best authors doubtless had something to do in giving the bent to his literary tastes and pursuits in after years. He should speak for himself in this Shakespearian ‘symposium.’

“It was not until I became master of the Cambridge high-school in 1862 that I did any really earnest work in the study of Shakespeare. There we regularly read some of the plays in the English course, and I began to make myself acquainted with the literature of the subject. We had no school editions worthy of the name at that time, and I was delighted when I got hold of Craik’s ‘English of Shakespeare,’ which I found a valuable aid in the reading of *Julius Cæsar*. This led to my *début* in print as a ‘Shakespearian,’ by the publication of an edition of Craik’s book in 1867.

“Three years after this it occurred to me to prepare a school edition of *The Merchant of Venice*, and the Harpers allowed me to decide upon the form in which the book was brought out. They declined, however, to commit themselves to the publication of a second play until the success of the first was assured; and I myself had no idea that I should wish to edit more than three or four of the plays then generally preferred for school reading; but after the *Tempest* and *Julius Cæsar*, and *Henry VIII.* had appeared, there seemed to be a demand for more and I went on with other plays likely to be used in school and college. When these were finished I was induced to complete an edition of the

plays and poems, which has been received with far more favor than I should have dared to anticipate. If the work were to be done over again, I believe I could do it much better. The preparation of such an edition is not a bad preliminary to the thorough study of the poet. The trite simile of gathering pebbles on the shore while the vast ocean stretches away to the horizon unexplored is the only one that seems in point after all.

W. J. ROLFE."

Mrs. Mary Cowden-Clarke, in writing her reply to the question proposed, was reminded that she had already answered it in the Preface to her American Edition of Shakespeare's Works, published by Messrs. Appleton & Co., of New York, in 1860, and accordingly she gave it again as follows:—

MRS. MARY COWDEN-CLARKE'S LETTER.

. . . "My affectionate veneration for Shakespeare began in childhood, when—a little girl—my father brought me home a new book, 'Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare,' and showed me the pictures, and told me something of each. Poor prints—(it was one of the earliest editions)—but figuring something of imagination and glorious beauty which even then had power to win my childish fancy, and made me long to know more of these wondrous new-world images. I remember particularly one, where Romeo, in Pilgrim habit, with staff and scallop-shelled hat, sat near to Juliet at the masquerade—making me anxious to know what words he was uttering that made him look so animated and so eager. Far too young to understand the significance of lover's love, I could yet comprehend the story of two unloving families taught the unholiness of their mutual hatred by the mutual love and early death of their two best children. LOVE in its largest sense—universal Charity and brotherhood—taught its lesson.

Subsequently came the day, when, at the breakfast-table of some friends in one of the beautiful western counties of England,—a week or so after my twentieth birthday—Shakespeare's excellences were enthusiastically discussed; and regret was expressed that there should be no ready clue to his quotable sentences, though they were so constantly in request; followed by my own secret desire that I could



supply this needed clue, even at the cost of a life-long toil. Sixteen years sufficed ; and the desired object was attained. The more he had been examined and studied, the more clear and beauteous had shone his exhaustless wealth ; the more it had been worked at and laboriously searched, the more welcome had grown the task in its own intrinsic recompense. Even such minute verbal scanning, such close mechanical scrutiny, instead of diminishing his lustre, served but to make it more perfectly manifest.

MARY COWDEN-CLARKE."

Mrs. Mary Cowden-Clarke may give us pardon for adding here, unauthorized, an additional reference that seems in point, in regard to her love for Shakespeare and that Shakespearian labour of love—her admirable Concordance. The following passage is taken from the second preface of 1881.

. . . "On the 15th of July, 1829, sitting at the breakfast-table of some friends in pleasant Somersetshire, regret was expressed that there existed no Concordance to Shakespeare; whose works formed the Bible of the Intellectual world. Eager in everything, I resolved there and then that *I* would write this desired Concordance ; and that very forenoon, while joining my friends in their walk through fields, I took a volume of the Poet and a pencil with me, and jotted down the first lines of my book under B :—

'Boatswain, have care.'

—*Temp* i., 1."



*A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE "TAMING OF THE  
SHREW."*

BY TALCOTT WILLIAMS.

THIS bibliography began in a finding-list of thirty or forty titles collected in the course of the usual preparation for the notice of the performance of Mr. Daly's company, to which reference is made below. In an evil hour, whose temptations every bibliographer knows, I began to enlarge it, until it has grown to these proportions—still far from complete. No references are included in it made to the play in editions of the complete works of Shakespeare, save in the case of the First Folio, and some effort has been made to extend it along a path too little travelled by giving references to notices of performances in the past and present. The references naturally divide into three parts: first, editions and derived plays; second, presentations; and third, comment. The last incidentally throws light on the vexed question of authorship by the omission of many familiar authors who treat of the general body of Shakespeare's work, but, and in general unconsciously, omit reference to this play, or make one so brief that it has escaped me. I have freely employed all catalogues within reach, after exhausting the works in libraries to which I had access, and in catalogues I include Mr. Cohn's invaluable bibliographies, as well as a manuscript copy of the entries in the Birmingham Library, which I owe to Mr. J. D. Mullins. Where I found a reference to a work whose full title I could not procure, I have used as much of the title as I could get, feeling that a clue was worth something. My entries will, I am aware, seem ragged to a professional bibliographer, but I am supported under the apprehension of his criticism by the twin facts that no one but a professional bibliographer will see this and that he expects nothing better of an amateur in a field where even the trained and experienced enthusiast finds absolute accuracy and

uniformity beyond the utmost efforts of man. In general, where special reasons existed, as in dealing with the first edition of Hazlitt's essays, I have given the title-page complete, but in other instances I present all which my own experience has found necessary, and in most cases much more than most similar bibliographers. At best, this is but a narrow bridge spanning one of the fruitful streams which flow from this fount to the open sea of men's praise.

#### I. EDITIONS AND RELATED PLAYS.

I give here first the early and original editions, including the folio, and then all related plays, alphabetically by editor or author, and chronologically by editions. In each of the citations, the total number of pages in a volume is indicated by prefacing "p." to the figures, and the space covered by the special reference to *Taming of the Shrew* by prefacing "Pages," the references being inclusive.

#### EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

It may be easier to follow these editions with this note. May 2, 1594, Peter Shorte enters *Taming of a Shrew* and published same, quarto; 1596, another quarto appears, published by Burbie; Cuthbert Burbie gets copyright, Jan. 22, 1606-7; assigns same to Nicholas Ling 1607, Ling brings out third quarto; Nov. 19, 1607, Ling transfers *Taming of a Shrew, Romeo and Juliet* and *Love's Labour's Lost*, as well as *Hamlet*, to John Smethwicke; Nov., 1623, Smethwicke, one of the publishers of first folio, publishes the first folio, in which the play appears as we now have it. The dates given to the authorship of the *Taming of the Shrew*, by Shakespeare, by various critics, are: Lloyd, 1592; Tieck and Drake, 1594; Malone, 1596 and earlier, 1606; Hall and Stokes, 1596; Chalmers, 1597; Grant White, 1601-3; Fleay, 1601-2; Collier, 1601-3; Frey, 1607-8; Farmer, 1607; Ward, 1619.

**SHAKESPEARE, WILLIAM.** Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. Published according to the True Originall Copies. London. Printed by Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount, 1623. Folio, p. (18), 993. Pages 208-229.

This is of course the title-page of the First Folio. "In some copies page 214 is printed 212; this affords one of the evidences that copies of the first edition vary, and that corrections were effected during the progress of the work through the press, and it may also be noted that signature V in many copies is indicated by Vv." The above note, italics as well as title, is from the fac-simile reprint of 1864. If a careful collation between the text of several folios in this play has ever been made to learn what changes were made on this signature, I have come across no reference to it.

— — Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, first quarto, sm. 4to, wanting preliminary leaves, sewed, unbound, about 1615-20.

This title is quoted from one of Mr. Bernard Quaritch's catalogues, where it is priced at £63. In Mr. Albert R. Frey's "Introduction," p. 4, to the volume of the "Bankside Shakespeare" containing this play, the reasons for assigning this early date to this edition are given, but appear vague.

- — A Wittie and Pleasant Comedie, called the *Taming of the Shrew*. As it was acted by his Maiesties Servants at the Blacke Friars and the Globe. Written by Will. Shakespeare. London. Printed by W. S. for John Smethwicke, and are to be sold at his shop, in Dunstones Churchyard, under the Diall. 1631. Quarto. The last page is signed I 4 verse.

Halliwell's "Brief List of Quarto Shakespeares," p. 4.

This title is also given in the Lenox Library Catalogue, New York, 1880. Friars is there spelled with an "e," by Halliwell with an "a." The extended note in the Lenox Catalogue gives these prices which the work has brought:—

Steevens, 1800, £303 11s.; Rhodes, 1828, 2108, £1 11s.; Sotheby's, May, 1856, £3 16s.; Halliwell, May, 1857, £5 5s.; and in 1859, £5 17s. 6d. (bought by Sir W. Tite). Copies are in the British Museum, the title appearing in the printed catalogue of books printed in England before 1640, III: 1392, and Capell collection, and in the Lenox, and Boston Public Library. Lowndes, 1303.

- SHAKESPEARE, W. *The Taming of the Shrew*. A comedy by. London. Printed by R. Walker, 1735, 12mo.

- — A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called *The taming of a Shrew*. As it was sundry times acted by the Right honorable, the Earle of Pembroke, his seruants. Printed at London by Peter Short, and are to be sold by Cutbert Burbie at his shop at the Royall Exchange. 1594, 4to, p. (2) (26) ff.

The only known copy was sold in Ingills Old Plays, 109, for £21, and resold at Heber's sale, Pt. IV, 2024, to Thomas Rodd for £94, on account of the Duke of Devonshire. Its title-page is No. 53 of Winsor's Heliotype fac-similes, and his Bibliography gives a valuable note, reprinted in the Lenox Library Catalogue, p. 28. The note in Bishop Heber's Catalogue is reprinted in Lowndes's ad hoc. A reference to it will also be found in Halliwell's "Dictionary of Old English Plays," p. 241. It was reprinted London, 1596<sup>9</sup> 4to, and in 1607.

- — A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called *The Taming of a Shrew*. [In prose and verse.] As it was sundrie times acted by the Right honorable Earle of Pembroke his servants [variously attributed to W. Shakespeare, to G. Peele and to R. Greene]. Imprinted . . . by P. S. . . . sold by C. Burbie, London, 1596, 4to, 161, b. 8.

"Without pagination. The resemblance between this play and Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew* is very close." This is the entry in the British Museum Catalogue (printed) of books "printed in England, etc., to the year 1640." London, 1884, Vol. III, p. 1392.

- — A Pleasaunt Conceited Historie, called *The Taming of a Shrew*, as it hath beene sundry Times acted by the right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his Servants. Printed at London by V. S. for Nicholas Ling, and are to be sold at his shop in Saint Dunston's Church-yard in Fleetstreet. 1607. 8vo.

This title is from the Barton Library Catalogue, and I give it because it varies from others in minute details.

AMYOT, THOMAS. *The Old Taming of a Shrew*, upon which Shakespeare Founded his Comedy. Reprinted from the Edition of 1594, and collated with the subsequent Editions of 1596 and 1607. Edited by Thomas Amyot. London. Printed for the Shakespeare Society, 1844, 8vo, p. ix, 91.

This contains a fac-simile of the title-page of the edition of 1594, and the text of *Taming of a Shrew*. It also contains the *Wife lapped in More's Skin*, p. 51-91, with a prefatory note.

ASHBEE, EDMUND W. A Pleasant Conceited Historie, called *The Taming of a Shrew*, as it was sundry times acted by the Right honorable, the Earle of Pembroke his seruants. Printed at London by Peter Short, and are to be sold by Cutbert Burbie, at his shop at the Royall Exchange. 1594. p. (2) (26) ff. Reprint, 4to.

This is the entry in the Barton Library Catalogue, another title-page reading "Dramatic fac-similes: superintended by Edmund W. Ashbee," etc. This was from the Duke of Devonshire's copy, 100 being printed. Other reprints are: Amyot's, Shakespeare Series, London, 1844 (a collation of 1594 and 1596); Halliwell's "Folio edition," London, 1856; in Hazlitt's "Shakespeare's Library," London, 1875; Charles Praetorius' reprint, 1886; Bankside Shakespeare, 1888.

HALLIWELL (PHILLIPPS), JAMES ORCHARD. ("Folio edition." Reprint of *Taming of a Shrew*.) London, 1856.

NICHOLS, JOHN. Six Old Plays, on which Shakespeare founded his *Measure for Measure*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Taming the Shrew*, *King John*, *K. Henry V* and *K. Henry VI*, *King Lear*. In two volumes. London: J. Nichols, 1779, 8vo. I, p. viii, 215; II, p. 216-464. Pages I, 159-215.

This contains a reprint of the *Taming of a Shrew*, and is a reprint of the copy of 1607 now at Chatworth, having passed from Steevens to Kemble, and thence to the Duke of Devonshire. Amyot, in his preface, p. vi, to his reprint, assigns this collection to Steevens. J. O. Halliwell, in "Shakespeariana," p. 9, gives 1766 as the date of Steevens' collection.

This reprint is alluded to by Mr. Samuel Hickson in "Notes and Queries," Series I, Vol. I, p. 194, 1845, in a communication which may not unfairly be deemed the beginning of controversy on this issue. Mr. Amyot's reprint was then issued, but of this neither Mr. Hickson nor others seem to be aware. A copy is in the Boston Public Library, from which this title is obtained.

PRAETORIUS, CHARLES. *The Taming of a Shrew*. The first quarto, 1594 (The play revised by another writer and Shakespere into *The Taming of the Shrew*.) A fac-simile by photolithography, from the Duke of Devonshire's unique original, by Charles Praetorius. With forewords by Frederick J. Furnivall, M.A., Trin. Hall, Cambridge; Hon. Dr. Phil., Berlin. London: Produced by C. Praetorius, 14 Clareville Grove, Hereford Square, S. W. 1886. Quarto, p. xiv, 52.

The "forewords" deal with authorship, Marlowe's share, and time—"four days altogether."

MORGAN, APPLETON. The Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies of Mr. William Shakespeare, as presented at the Globe and Blackfriars Theatres, circa 1591-1623. . . . The Bankside Shakespeare. New York : The Shakespeare Society of New York. Brentanos, Paris, New York, Chicago, Trübner & Co., London. (1888), p. (4), 277, (1).

Contains in its second volume, whose title is given above.

The Bankside Shakespeare, II. *The Taming of the Shrew* (The Players' text of *The Taming of a Shrew*, of 1594, with the Heminges and Condell Text of 1623). With an analytical study of the growth of the Play, and touching the question as to whether both Plays are the work of William Shakespeare. By Albert R. Frey, Esq. . . . New York : The Shakespeare Society of New York, 1888.

"It is evident Shakespeare rewrote it" (*The Taming of a Shrew*) "for Mr. John Smethwicke, under the title of *The Taming of the Shrew* some time between November 19, 1607, and 1609."

#### ADAPTATIONS AND RELATED PLAYS.

BAUGHAN, ROSA. Shakespeare's plays. Abridged and revised for the use of girls. By Rosa Baughan. Second edition. London : R. Washbourne. 1871. 8vo, p. 167.

Barton collection. Contains seventeen plays, of which the fourth is *Taming of the Shrew*.

BULLOCK, CHRISTOPHER. *The Cobbler of Preston*. London, 1716.

The author's name is also given as Charles. Produced Lincoln's Inn Fields, Jan. 20, 1716. A fifth edition appeared 1767.

— — *The Cobler of Preston*, a farce. As it is acted at the Theatre Royal in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields. Written by Christopher Bullock. The fifth edition. London : S. Bladon. 1767. 8vo, p. 30.

BULLTHAUP, HEINRICH. Dramaturgie der Classiker. Shakespeare. Oldenburg, Schulze'sche Hof-Buchhandlung, 1883, 8vo, p. liii, 397.

Contains in the third part, under comedies, "Der Widerspänstigen Zähmung."

COLLIER, J. PAYNE. *A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*. Edited by J. Payne Collier. See Heywood, Thomas. Shakespeare Society Publications. London, 1850, 8vo, p. 168. Pages 95-168.

CRUIKSHANK, ROBERT. See Garrick, David.

DANIEL, GEORGE. Cumberland's British Theatre. London, 1864-1872.

Cohn's Bibliography. *The Taming of the Shrew* appeared in the above series among fifteen plays, in all, "with remarks by D——. G."

DALY, AUGUSTIN. *Taming of the Shrew*. A comedy by Shakespere. Arranged to be played in four acts by Augustin Daly. Produced at Daly's Theatre, February, 1887. With an introduction by William Winter. Privately printed. New York, 1887. 8vo, sewed, p. 69.

DRINHARDSTEIN, BAUDISSION VON. Die Widerspänstige. Lustspiel in vier Aufzügen von Shakspeare. Mit Benulzung einiger Theile der Übersetzung des Grafen Baudission von Drinhardstein. Wien. J. B. Wallishauser. 1839. 8vo, p. (6) 112.

G—, D—. *Taming of the Shrew*. As performed, etc. With remarks by D. G. London (Cumberland's Theatre), 1828. 12mo, 6d.

Lowndes.

GARRICK, DAVID. *Catherine and Petruchio*. A comedy in three acts, altered from *The Taming of a Shrew* [by D. Garrick]. 8vo. Lond. Tonson. 1756.

— — *Catharine and Petruchio*. A comedy, in three acts. As it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. Alter'd from Shakespear's *Taming of the Shrew*. London: J. and R. Tonson and S. Draper. 1756. 8vo, p. (8) 56.

The first is the title as given by Halliwell in "Shakespeariana," p. 9. The second is from the Barton collection. Garrick's adaptation is the familiar stage version, and has been repeatedly published. It was first performed as an after-piece to the *Winter's Tale*, March 18, 1754, and has been a favorite after-piece in English benefits. The "prologue," with apparently the original orthography, is given in "Prologues and Epilogues," London, 1779, Vol. III, p. 235.

— — *Catharine and Petruchio*. A comedy, in three acts. As it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane and at the Theatre in Edinburgh. Alter'd from Shakespear's *Taming of the Shrew*. With alterations and additions by David Garrick. Edinburgh. M. Jarvie. 1756. sm. 8vo, p. (4) 27.

— — *Catherine and Petruchio*, in three acts, with original prologue.

This gives the Edinburgh as well as Covent Garden cast, and was reprinted in 1792. (Lowndes), and London, 1811 (Lowndes). It appears in:—

— — A collection of the most esteemed Farces and Entertainments performed on the British Stage. Edinburgh, 1786. 12mo, 6 vols. Vol. III. Pages 290-317.

— — *Catherine and Petruchio*, a comedy, altered from Shakespere, by David Garrick. Adapted for theatrical representation. As performed at the Theatres Royal, Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Regulated from the prompt-book by permission of the managers. The lines distinguished by inverted commas are omitted in the representation. London: J. Cawthorn, 1806. 12mo, p. 55. Portrait Wm. C. Kemble as Catherine.

Barton Catalogue. Part of Cauthorn's "Minor British Drama."

— — *Catherine and Petruchio*, A comedy in three acts; altered from Shakespeare by David Garrick, Esq.; as performed at the Theatre Royal, Covent-Garden. (Cast.)

This appears to be the text generally employed in reprints, although the prologue is omitted. It appears in:—

INCHBALD, MRS. (ELIZABETH). A collection of farces and other after-pieces which are acted at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, Covent Garden, and Haymarket. Printed under authority of the Managers from the Prompt Book. Selected by Mrs. Inchbald. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees & Orme, 1809. 16mo, 7 vols. Vol. IV, p. 288. Pages 143-171.

— — *Katherine and Petruchio*. Altered from the *Taming of the Shrew*, by D. Garrick. Revised by J. P. Kemble. London, 1810. 8vo.

Lowndes.

— — Shakspeare's *Katharine and Petruchio*, a comedy; taken by David Garrick from *The Taming of a shrew*: revised by J. P. Kemble; and now published as it is performed at the Theatres Royal. London: J. Miller, 1815. 8vo, p. 34.

Barton Collection. Lowndes quotes this 1s.

— — *Catharine and Petruchio*; a comedy. In three acts. As altered by Garrick from Shakspeare. New York: T. Longworth, 1820. 12mo, p. 35.

— — Shakspeare's *Katherine and Petruchio*, a comedy, by D. Garrick, from the *Taming of the Shrew*. Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank. London, 1838. 12mo.

Lowndes.

— — Hind's English Stage. *Katharine and Petruchio* (taken from *Taming of the Shrew*, by David Garrick); a comedy. By William Shakspeare. Acting edition, with accurate stage directions. Embellished with a beautiful engraving. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1839. 12mo, p. 32 (1).

Barton Collection.

— — *Katharine and Petruchio*. Hind's acting edition, with description of the costume, stage directions, etc. London: Simkins & Co., 1839. Cr. 8vo, 8d.

Lowndes.

— — *Katherine and Petruchio*. Lacey's Acting Edition, with preliminary notes. London, n. d. (1855). 12mo, 6d.

Lowndes.

— — *Katharine and Petruchio*. A comedy in three acts. Altered by David Garrick from the *Taming of a Shrew*, by William Shakspeare. With illustration by R. Cruikshank. London: Lacy, n. d. (1865). 12mo, p. 41. Lacy's Acting Edition, No. 926, Vol. 62.

Cohn's Bibliographies. Gives Characters: Covent Garden, 1838; Olympia, April, 1864; Surrey, April, 1864; Marylebone, April, 1864.



- — — No. CIV. French's Standard Drama, edited by F. C. Wemyss. *Katharine and Petruchio*. A Comedy, in three acts, by Shakespeare, with the stage business, cast of characters, costumes, relative positions, etc. New York: Samuel French & Son, publishers, 38 East Fourteenth street. London: Samuel French, publisher, 89 Strand. 12mo, p. 30.

— Gives cast at Niblo's, New York, 1853, and was originally preceded by a memoir of Edwin Forrest. Its omission leaves the pages of the present issue 30, although the paging runs to 34. A brief paragraph by Mr. Wemyss gives the history of this adaptation by Garrick. This is also catalogued by French & Co. as Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, and was first issued about 1853.

- — — A Collection and Selection of English Prologues and Epilogues, commencing with Shakespeare and concluding with Garrick, in four volumes. London, 1779. Printed for Fielding & Walker. Vol. III. Page 235.

— Gives Prologue spoken at production of *Winter's Tale* with *Taming of the Shrew* as after-piece in 1759.

- JOHNSON, CHARLES. *The Cobler of Preston*. As it is acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. By his Majesty's servants. Written by Mr. Johnson. London: W. Hinchcliffe, 1716. 8vo, p. (6) 47. Frontispiece.

— This adaptation was first performed at Drury Lane, 1716, and as late as 1816. Halliwell's "Hand-list," 9, gives, as the third edition, "The Cobbler of Preston, from Shakespeare, third edition, 1716, and, 221, 'The Cobbler of Preston, altered from Shakespeare, first edition, 1719.'"

- — — *The Cobler of Preston*. As it is acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. By his majesty's servants. Written by Mr. Johnson. The second edition. London: W. Hinchcliffe, 1786. 8vo, p. (6) 47.

- GASCOIGNE, GEORGE. *The Comedie called Supposes*. London, 1587.

— This is the comedy translated from Ariosto's *Gli Suppositi*, and represented at Gray's Inn, 1596.

- H., M. B. *The Taming of the Shrew*, a comedy in five acts, by Shakespeare. Arranged for drawing-room acting or school theatricals by M. B. H. London: Sampson, Low & Co., 1881. 8vo, p. 78.

Cohn's Bibliography.

- HALLIWELL-(PHILLIPPS), JAMES ORCHARD. Shakespearian drolls, from a rare book, printed about A.D. 1698, entitled The theatre of ingenuity. Edited by J. O. Halliwell. London: printed (by C. Whittingham) for the editor. 1859. Sm. 8vo, p. 28 (1).

— Contains extracts from *Taming of the Shrew*, Acts II and V, under the following title.

— *The Mad Wooing: or a Way to Win and Tame a Shrew*; being the course a gentleman took to gain a young lady with a great fortune, on whom by reason of her frowardness none before would venture. The lady's advice to froward women, minding them of her example of their duties towards their husbands.

HEYWOOD, THOMAS. *A Woman Kilde with Kindnesse*. As it hath bene oftentimes acted by the Queene's Majest. Servants. The Third Edition. London. Printed by Isaac Jaggard, 1617. Shakespeare Society Publications. London, 1850. 8vo, p. 168. Pages 93-168.

Introduction and notes by J. Payne Collier.

HINTON, HENRY S. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Acting Plays of Edwin Booth. New York. 8vo, p. 30.

This was in addition to the fourteen numbers issued in this series, of which four were non-Shakespearian. It was withdrawn early, being replaced by Mr. William Winter's edition. I have been unable to obtain the date of publication. It was on sale in 1876.

KEMBLE, JOHN PHILIP. See Garrick, David.

KETSCHER, N. Shakespeare. 'From the English, by N. Ketscher. Vols. 1-4. Moscow: Printed by E. Stepanoff. 1841-8. 12mo.

Barton Collection. Russian translation, containing ten plays, of which one is *Taming of the Shrew*.

KÖHLER, REINHOLD. Kunst über alle Künste ein böß Weil gut zu machen. Eine deutsche Bearbeitung von Shakespeare's *The taming of the shrew* aus dem Jahr 1672. Neu herausgegeben mit Beifügung des englischen Originals und Ammerkungen von Reinhold Köhler. Berlin. Weidmannische Buchhandlung. 1864. 8vo, p. xliii, 268.

LACEY, J(OHN). *Sauny the Scott: or the Taming of the Shrew: a comedy*. As it is now acted at the Theatre Royal. Written by J. Lacey, servant to his majesty. And never before printed. London: E. Whitlock, 1698. 4to, p. (4) 48.

This is an adaptation of the *Taming of the Shrew*, of which Pepys says, "generally is but a mean play." A summary of its history will be found in "All the Year Around," vol. xxiv, p. 513. It was revived in 1698 at Drury Lane, and at Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre in 1725, Charles Bullock as Sawney. Halliwell, in "Shakespeariana," gives, p. 9, an edition 4to, 1698, and in his "Hand-list," 122, "*Sauny the Scot, or the Taming of the Shrew*, 1708."

— *Sauny the Scot; or the Taming of the Shrew: a comedy*, as it is now acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane, by her majesty's company of comedians. Written by John Lacy. London: B. Bragge, 1708. 4to, p. (6) 63.

— — *Sawney, the Scott; or, the Taming of the Shrew*, as it is now acted at the Theatre Royal. London, 1698, 4to. London: printed for E. Curll, 1714, 12mo.

LACY, —. Acting Edition *Katharine and Petruchio*. London, n. d. (1835). Vol. lxii, No. 26. Pages 41.

Cohn's Bibliography.

LIEBAU, GUSTAV. Die Shakespeare Galeri. Eine Sammlung literar-ästhetischer Abhandlungen über acht der bedeutenderen Dramen Shakespeare's. Für Verehrer der Dichters herausgegeben. Berlin: Carl Salewski, 1878. 8vo, p. 220.

Cohn's Bibliography includes eight plays, of which No. 4 is *Taming of the Shrew*.

LIEBLERN, HENNING. Künste über alle Künste. Ein böß Weib gut zu machen. Vormahls von einem Italianischen Cavalier practiciret: jetzo aber von einem Tentiben Edelman glücklich nachgeahnet, und in einem sehr lustigen Possen vollem freuden-spiele fûrgestellt . . . 1672. 12mo, p. 238.

This title and a collation of the work is given in Cohn's "Shakespeare in Germany," p. cxxiv.

ROLFE, WILLIAM J(AMES). Shakespeare's comedy of the *Taming of the Shrew*. Edited with notes by William J. Rolfe, A.M. . . . With engravings. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1881. 16mo, p. 180.

REYNOLDS, FREDERICK. *The Taming of the Shrew* (Opera). London, 1828?

Presented at Covent Garden. "All the Year Round," vol. xxiv, p. 515, gives a reference to it, from which I have reconstructed this title, although, for aught I have been able to learn, it may never have been printed.

SCHINK, — VON. Die bezähmte Widerbellerinn oder Gasner der zweyte. Ein Lustspiel in vier Acten. Nach Shakespear frey bearbeitet von Schink. Aufgeführt auf dem kurfürstl. Hoftheater in München. 1783. 8vo, p. 80.

STEEVENS, GEORGE. Twenty of the plays of Shakespeare, being the whole number printed in quarto during his lifetime, or before the restoration, collated where there were different copies, and publish'd from the originals, by George Steevens. In 4 vols. London: J. and R. Tonson, 1766.

The first play in Vol. II is "*The Taming of the Shrew*, 1631."

TOBIN, JOHN. *The Honeymoon*, a comedy in five acts, as performed at the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, with universal applause. Philadelphia: printed for E. Bronson at the office of the United States Gazette, 1805. 8vo, 85 (2).

VALENTINE, MRS. (C.). Shakespearian tales in verse, illustrated by R. André. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son [1881]. 4to, p. 101.

Contains four plays, of which one is *Taming of the Shrew*, done into rhyme for children; full-page colored illustrations by André, engraved by Emrik & Binger, London edition, Warne & Co.

WEHL, FEODOR. *Der Widerspänstigen Zähmung*. Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen von Shakespeare, mit Zungrundelegung von Schlegel's Uebersetzung und Drinhardsteins Ein richtung, neu bearbeitet von Feodor Wehl. Erfurt: Bartholomäus, 1877. 8vo, p. ix, 104.

WEILEN, ALEXANDER VON. Shakespeare's Vorspiel zu *Der Widerspänstigen Zähmung*. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Litteraturgeschichte. Frankfurt a. M.: Literarische Anstatt. Rüllen & Lönning, 1884. 8vo, p. 4-93.

WIDMANN, JOSEPH VIKTOR. Book of Words. *The Taming of the Shrew*. (Der Widerspänstigen Zähmung). A comic opera in four acts, freely arranged from Shakespeare's comedy. Music by Hermann Goetz. The English version by J. Troutbeck. London: Augener & Co., 1880. 8vo, p. 63.

— — Arien und Gesänge aus *Der Widerspänstigen Zähmung*. Komische Oper in vier Acten nach Shakespeare's Lustspiel frei bearbeitet von Joseph Viktor Widmann. Musik von Herrmann Goetz. Aufführungsrecht vorbehalten. Den Bühnen gegenüber als Manuscript gedruckt. Nach Anordnung der Königlichen General-Intendantur. Berlin: Eigenthum und Verlag von Fr. Kistner in Leipzig, 1882. 12mo, p. 79.

The three above from Cohn's Bibliography.

— — Book of the Words. *The Taming of the Shrew*. A comic opera in four acts, freely arranged from Shakespeare's comedy with the same title by Joseph Viktor Widmann, Music by Hermann Goetz. The English version by the Rev. J. Troutbeck, M.A. Charles D. Koppel, publisher, 23 Park Row, New York, n. d. 8vo, p. 32.

This version was published in 1886, and contains six of the airs for songs.

WINTER, WILLIAM. The Prompt-book. Edited by William Winter. Shakespeare's comedy of *Katherine and Petruchio*, as presented by Edwin Booth (Notes). New York: printed for William Winter by Francis Hart & Company, 63 and 65 Murray street. 1878. (New York.) 12mo, p. 49.

A brief preface says that this version is an alteration of Garrick's *Katherine and Petruchio*, and sums up the history of the play. In the notes, which include quotations from other authorities, Mr. Winter says; "The text in this version of the *Taming of the Shrew* is, with a few trifling exceptions, that of Shakespeare."

WORSDALE, J(AMES). *A Cure for a Scold*, a ballad farce of two acts; (founded upon Shakespeare's *Taming of a Shrew*.) By J. Worsdale, portrait painter. London: L. Gilliver (1735). 8vo. p. (10) 1-16, 25-29, (1).

Lowndes gives this title as a ballad opera.

— — *A Cure for a Scold*. Ballad opera. By J. Worsdale. London, 1738.

Lowndes.

(Serbian.)

A Serbian edition, 16mo, p. 61, 1882, is noted in Cohn's Bibliography, but I am unable to reproduce the type.

— — Here begynneth a merry Ieste of a shrewde and curste Wyfe, lapped in Morrelles Skin, for her good behauyour. Imprinted at London, in Fleete streete, beneath the Conduits, at the signe of Iohn Euangelist, by H. Jackson.

This is J. Payne Collier's title, and was printed, he says, about 1550 to 1560. It has also been printed in Utterson's collection, in Amyot's reprints, and in the "Shakespeare Library." It is cognate to the *Taming of the Shrew*, but bears at best but a distant relation.

— — Die wunderbare Heurath Petruvio mit der bösen Catharine, den 5, 6, 7 Martii auf dem Zittanischen Schauplatze vorgestillet.

This is the only record of this play, title and production, in 1658. See Cohn's "Shakespeare in Germany," p. cxxv, quoted from Gottsched.

— — *The Taming of the Shrew*. Shakespearian Tales in Verse. New York: McLaughlin Bros. 1882. Quarto, paper, p. 146.

A transcription of the play in doggerel, and one of McLaughlin Bros.'s picture-books for children, printed from a London original.

TO BE CONTINUED.

A LIST OF SHAKESPEARE OPERAS, OPERATIZED  
DRAMAS, AND OVERTURES.

COMPILED BY HELEN A. CLARKE.

[Inquiries in regard to Shakespeare music have frequently been received by the Editor of this magazine, and some index to this special subject is likely to prove useful. Though completeness cannot, in the nature of the case, be claimed for this list,—since the data for such a list has to be found in one knows not what obscure and widely scattered corners,—yet it may be said that the list here given covers its ground more fully than any yet published. The admirable collection of the New Shakspeare Society (Publications for 1884, Series VIII, Miscellany 3, "A List of the Songs and Passages in Shakspeare which have been set to music." Compiled by J. Greenhill, the Rev. W. A. Harrison, and F. J. Furnivall, together with the "Critical and Historical Programme of the Music given at the Society's Second Annual Musical Entertainment"—May 9, 1884. By James Lecky, Esq.) offers the best guidance obtainable in the more important department of Shakespeare music, the songs and settings: the present list aims merely to eke out its help to those interested in the music related to or suggested by the Shakespearian drama in another branch of the subject. See, also, Shakespeare-Music, Parts I and II, in SHAKESPEARIANA for January and February, 1888. The date given in the following list is that of first representation, except in some cases when this was not ascertained, or when the date of the Composer's birth is set down instead. The interrogation mark is used when it did not seem certain, but only likely, that the composition was founded upon the Shakespeare Play of similar name. Any additions or further useful information that can be supplied will be welcomed.]—THE EDITOR.

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA.

*Cleopatra* (?), opera by Mattheson, Hambourg, 1704.

*Antoine et Cleopatre*, opera by Kaffka, Breslau, 1781.

*La Morte di Cleopatra* (?), opera by Nasolini, 1771.

*Cleopatra* (?), opera by Weigl, 1807.

*Antoine et Cleopatre*, ballet by Rudolphe Kreutzer, Paris, 1808.

*Cleopatra* (?), opera by Paer, 1810.

## AS YOU LIKE IT.

*As You Like It*, as given at Drury Lane Theatre, music by Dr. Arne, 1740.

The songs in this drama were :—

1. "When daisies pied," *Love's Labour's Lost*. Solo, T.
2. "Under the greenwood tree." Solo, T.
3. "Blow, blow, thou winter wind." Solo, T.
4. "Tell me where is fancy bred," *Merchant of Venice*. Solo, T.

*As You Like It*, as performed at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, music by Henry R. Bishop, 1824.

The songs in this drama were :—

1. "Whilst inconstant Fortune smiled," *Pass. Pil.*, 20. Duet, T. and A.
  2. "Ah me! what eyes hath love put in my head," *Sonnet* cxlviii. Solo, T.
  3. "Oh Time! thou shalt not boast that I do change," *Sonnet* cxxiii. Solo, T.
  4. "E'en as the sun with purple-colored face," *Ven. and Ad.* Glee, A., T., T., B.
  5. "Under the greenwood tree," by Dr. Arne. Solo, T.
  6. "Fair was my love," *Pass. Pil.*, 7. Solo, T.
  7. "Crabbed age and youth," *Pass. Pil.*, 12. Trio, T., A., B.
  8. "Blow, blow, thou wintry wind," by Dr. Arne. Solo, T.
- Parts of *As You Like It*, by Tausch.  
Overture to *As You Like It*, by J. K. Paine.

## COMEDY OF ERRORS.

Operatized *Comedy of Errors*, by H. R. Bishop, London, 1819.

The songs in this were :—

1. "It was a lover and his lass," *As You Like It*. Solo, T.
2. "Beauty is but a vain and doubtful good," *Pass. Pil.* Solo.
3. "Blow, blow, thou wintry wind," *As You Like It*. Glee, arr. for four voices, from Dr. Arne's and J. S. Stevens' settings. A., T., T., B.
4. "The poor soul sat sighing," *Othello*. Solo, T.



5. "Under the greenwood tree," *As You Like It*. Glee, arr. for four voices, from Dr. Arne's setting. A., T., T., B.
6. "Saint Withold footed thrice the wold," *Lear*. Duet, for two male voices.
7. "Come live with me," *Pass. Pil.*, by Marlowe. Solo, T.
8. "Sweet rose, fair flower," *Pass. Pil.* Solo, A.
9. "What shall he have that killed the deer?" *As You Like It*. Hunting glee for four male voices.
10. "Take, O take these lips away," *Measure for Measure*. Solo, T.
11. "As it fell upon a day," *Pass. Pil.* Duet, T., A.
12. "Come, thou monarch of the vine," *Antony and Cleopatra*. Glee, A., T., B.
13. "Ah! how the spring of love," *Two Gen of Ver.* Solo, A.
14. "Lo! here the gentle lark," *Venus and Adonis*. Solo, S.

CORIOLANUS.

- Coriolano* (?), opera, by Cavalle, Parma, 1660.  
*Coriolano* (?), opera, by Ariosti, London, 1723.  
*Coriolano* (?), opera, by Calaaca, Vienna, 1717.  
*Coriolano* (?), opera, by Treu, Breslau, 1726.  
*Coriolano* (?), opera, by Grassey, Berlin, 1750.  
*Coriolano* (?), opera, by Niccolini, 1810.  
 Overtures to *Coriolanus*, by Beethoven, Beruh, and Anselm Weber.

HAMLET.

- Opera of *Hamlet*, libretto by Apostolo Zeno, music by Gasparini, Venice, 1705.  
*Amleto*, opera, by Scarlatti, Rome, 1715.  
 Entr' acte and several pieces of music for *Hamlet*, by Holly, 1747.  
 Entr' acte to *Hamlet*, by Holland, published in Berlin, 1790.  
*Amleto*, opera, by Caruso, Florence, 1790.  
 Overture and Entr' acte to *Hamlet*, by the Abbé Vogler, 1791.  
*Amleto*, opera, by Mercadante, 1822.  
*Hamlet*, opera, in three acts, by Mareczek, Brun, 1843.

- Amleto*, opera, by Buzzola, 1847.  
*Hamlet*, German opera, by Alexander Stadfelt, Darmstadt, 1857.  
*Amleto*, opera, by Faccio Gènes, 1865.  
*Hamlet*, opera, libretto by Barbier and Carré, music by Ambroise Thomas, first given in Paris, 1868.  
Overtures to *Hamlet*, by Gade, Liszt, Joachim, Macfarren.  
Symphonic poem to *Hamlet*, by E. A. McDowell, New York, 1888.  
*Hamlet*, opera, by M. Hignard, Nantes, 1888.  
*Hamlet*, a Psychic sketch for grand orchestra, by H. W. Nichols, 1888.

## HENRY IV.

- Henry IV*, opera, by Balfe, London, 1838.

## HENRY VIII.

- Incidental music to *Henry VIII*, by Hatton, Princess's Theatre, 1855.

## HENRY V.

- Incidental music to *Henry V*, an arr. of old music with new music added, by J. Isaacson, London, 1858.

## JULIUS CÆSAR.

- Jules César* (?), opera, by Keiser, Hamburg, 1710.  
*Giulio Cesare* (?), opera, by Perez, Lisbonne, 1762.  
Overture to *Cæsar*, by Schumann.  
Music to *Julius Cæsar*, by Von Bülow.

## KING JOHN.

- Overture to *King John*, by Radecke.

## KING LEAR.

- King Lear*, opera, by André, Berlin, 1780.  
*Cordélia*, Lyrical drama, in one act, by Conradin Kreutzer, Daneschingen, 1819.

*Cordélia*, opera, by Séméladis, Versailles, 1854.

*King Lear*, opera, by Verdi.

Incidental music for *Lear*, by Hatton.

Overture to *King Lear*, by Berlioz.

MACBETH.

*Macbeth*, music, Sir W. Davenant's version, by Matthew Locke, performed first at theatre in Dorset Gardens, 1672.

*Macbeth*, music, by John Eccles, Drury Lane Theatre, 1696.

*Macbeth*, opera, by André, Berlin, 1780.

*Macbeth*, opera, by Stegman, Hamburg, 1784.

*Makbeth*, mit Gesang, by Mederitsch (or Gallus), about 1791.

Overture, Chorus and Ballet to *Macbeth*, by Reichard, Munich, 1795.

*Macbeth*, opera, by Holly of Breslau (b. 1747).

*Macbeth*, overture, by Eberwein, 1828.

*Macbeth*, opera, by Rastrelli, Dresden, 1817.

*Macbeth*, Poème Symphonique for orchestra, by Henry Hugo Pierson, 1817.

Opera of *Macbeth*, libretto by Hix and Rouget de l'Isle, music by Chélaré, first given in Paris at the Grand Opéra, 1827.

Overture to *Macbeth*, by Pearsall, Mayance, 1828.

*Macbeth*, opera, by Rietz, Dusseldorf, 1840.

*Macbeth*, opera, libretto by Piave, music by Verdi, first given in Florence, 1847.

Music for *Macbeth*, by Hatton, London, 1853.

*Macbeth*, opera, in five acts, by Taubert, first given in Berlin, 1857.

*Biorn*, opera, libretto adapted from *Macbeth* by Frank Marshall, music by Lauro Rossi, 1877.

Music for *Macbeth*, by Samuel Arnorld (b. 1737).

Music for *Macbeth*, by Kelly of California, given in New York in 1887.

Music for *Macbeth*, by Sir Arthur Sullivan, 1888.

Sketch of Overture and Chorus to *Macbeth*, by Beethoven.

Overture to *Macbeth*, by Spohr.

## MERCHANT OF VENICE.

*Marchand de Venice*, opera, by J. A. Just, Amsterdam, 1787.

*The Merchant of Venice*, opera, by Signor Petrella.

Music for *Merchant of Venice*, by Hatton, London, 1858.

Overture to *Merchant of Venice*, by Macfarren.

## MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR.

*Falstaff*, opera, in two acts, by Salieri, Vienna, 1798.

Operatized *Merry Wives of Windsor*, by Charles E. Horn, Drury Lane Theatre, 1823.

The songs in this are :—

1. "I know a bank," *Midsummer-Night's Dream*. Duet, T., A.

2. "All that glitters is not gold," *Mer. of Ven.* Duet, T., A.

3. "Blow, blow, thou winter wind," *As You Like It*. Solo, T.

4. "Crabbed age and youth," *Pass. Pil.* Solo.

5. "Even as the sun," *Venus and Adonis*. Solo, T.

6. "It was a lordling's daughter," *Pass. Pil.* Solo, T.

7. "When it is the time of night," *Midsummer-Night's Dream*. Solo, T.

8. "Trip, trip away," *Midsummer-Night's Dream*. Chorus of fairies.

Operatized *Merry Wives of Windsor*, as given at Drury Lane Theatre, 1834. The songs in it are by Welsh, Horn, Dr. Arne, Parry.

*Falstaff*, opera, by Balfe, London, 1838.

*Die Lustigen Weiber von Windsor*, opera, libretto by Mosenthal, music by Nicolai, Berlin, 1849.

*Falstaff*, comic opera, in one act, by Adolphe Adam, Paris, 1856.

Music to *Merry Wives of Windsor*, by Sir Arthur Sullivan, 1888.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

# A School of Shakespeare.

---

For his bounty,  
There was no winter in't; an autumn 'twas  
That grew the more by reaping.

—*Antony & Cleopatra*, V, II, 86.

---

## HENRY VIII.

**I**N the times of Henry VIII we find ourselves far and away beyond the days of Richard III; events had marched rapidly; the peoples and their governments had begun to find one another out; we stand upon the verge looking over the expanse of modern life. Who shall describe now, in the retrospect, what that time was to the peoples just rousing themselves to the realization of human liberty? What an immense idea to conceive: freedom! No wonder it takes the world long to apprehend it and still longer to appreciate it and to act upon it. And yet love of freedom, that ancestral mission and glory handed down from Teutonic forefathers to Englishman and German alike, was stirring the pulses and quickening the intellectual and moral life with youthful impetuosity throughout that England which seemed to sit bowed so tamely beneath the grinding despotism of Wolsey and Cromwell and Henry VIII. Men had learned in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries that they could think freely; and thus had resulted the astounding discovery of another side to the world. Thought, that sat brooding, dove-like, upon the face of the deep, had taken to itself the white wings of an ocean-sailing ship, had sped across the unbounded expanse of waters and had brought back, not the olive branch of peace, but the resistless temptation of yellow gold and hopes of conquest.

Excited by its triumphs in the physical world, thought turned in

upon itself to explore the dim world of the human soul, and, throwing off the bonds of authority, proclaimed through the mouth of Martin Luther in tones that rang through Europe that man was free to believe as he was to think. "Here I stand; God help me; I can do no otherwise." Free to think, free to believe, that was great; but man was not yet free to speak, as was demonstrated by many a dungeon, many a bloody block, many a blazing pile where during long years yet to come martyrs testified unto death to the sacred rights of human conscience; nor was man free to act, to come and to go, to buy and to sell without hindrance as we understand freedom of action and of trade in this country now, imperfect as our understanding and practice is even yet.

Still the England of Henry VIII had made great advances and was pervaded by a great hope, a hope destined to be deferred during the latter part of the King's reign and during the reign of his daughter Mary, until the heart of the nation was made sick from the long waiting.

At last Elizabeth came, and England arose, stalwart as a giant to run his race. Hope had its fruition, if limited, still its fruition, in the various departments of human life, in creature comforts, in explorations, in commerce, in religion, in intellectual pursuits, in the exercise of the imagination and the expression of the emotions through the superb Elizabethan drama. To this outburst of life, Henry's reign was preparatory.

The limits set to this brief article do not admit of even a passing notice of the greater part of the material bearing directly and indirectly upon it, for in almost everything historical about Elizabeth there is something about her father also. For the development of the man and the growth of his despotic power, see the accounts given in Green's *Short History of the English People*, in Froude's *History of England*, in Moberly's *Early Tudors (Epochs of Modern History)*, in Creighton's *Cardinal Wolsey (Twelve English Statesmen)*, in Hume's *History of England*. For the story of his domestic life, see, besides the play itself, Strickland's *Queens of England*, where the long list of his wives is given. The beauty of Queen

Katherine's character is testified to by Miss Strickland and by Mrs. Jameson (*Characteristics of Women*), no less than by Shakespeare, who doubtless wrote according to the feeling and tradition of his day. She seems to have been a sixteenth century Griselda, worthy to rank with Chaucer's famous heroine and with the Enid of the *Idyls of the King*. In Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* (*Pitt Press Series*) we see the intense aspiration of the times toward higher and better things, as in K stlin's *Life of Martin Luther* or D'Aubigne's *History of the Reformation* we see that aspiration sturdily demonstrated in action. In Robertson's *Charles V*, in Guizot's *History of France* (during the times of Francis I), in Motley's *Dutch Republic*, in Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, the *Conquest of Mexico*, and the *Conquest of Peru*, in the history of the Popes, in Lea's *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy* and in his *History of the Inquisition*, we may find the history of the age, and with the charm of poetic imagination added in Scott's *Marmion* and Wallace's *The Fair God*, the story of the capture of the City of Mexico. The account by Green (*History of English People*) of the influence in the University life of Erasmus, Colet, and others, and of the study of Greek, helps us to understand the religious ferment of the times and of the succeeding reigns.

In bringing to a stop, for bringing to an end would be clearly out of the question, this brief outline of historical reading based upon Shakespeare's Historical Plays, it is proper to repeat that the Course was intended to be suggestive. Much has been omitted that could and perhaps should have found a place here; but much had to be omitted, or rather but little selected. Still it is hoped that enough is given in prose and poetry, in fact and fiction, to form a running commentary at once interesting and valuable on the plays of our great dramatist, who is also in his way a great historian.

WM. TAYLOR THOM.



# Open Court.

---

That's a question; how shall we try it?

—*The Comedy of Errors*, V, 1, 421.

In this I'll be impartial; be you judge  
Of your own cause.

—*Measure for Measure*, V, 1, 166.

---

## THE CASE OF FLEAY VERSUS FURNESS.

REPORTED BY THE AUTHOR OF THE "LIFE AND WORK (NOT  
WORKS) OF SHAKESPEARE."

I SHALL not encroach on the limits allowed by the editor of SHAKESPEARIANA by giving all the arguments of the contending parties in this case in full; but shall confine my notes to such matters as are of interest to the general body of dramatic students. These happen to turn on questions of importance in theatrical history, and need no apology for their introduction here. I will endeavor to be as impartial as the failings of human nature will allow.

Fleay strongly objects to Furness (*Variorum, Merchant of Venice*, pp. 285, 324) mixing up arguments drawn from his *Life and Work of Shakespeare*, 1886, with others taken from his *Shakespeare Manual*, 1876. The latter book was stereotyped without his consent, and of course in many instances is behind the present state of our knowledge. So, when Furness (p. 284) tells us that Fleay says "that the Lord Chamberlain's men acted at the Rose in 1594," this, fairly interpreted, only shows that in 1876 he had not discovered that the acting of the Chamberlain's men at Newington Butts was confined to the limits of June 3-13, in consequence of the inhibition of the Rose (*Life*, pp. 22, 116), and that Henslow had separated this Newington Butts account from that of the Admiral's men at the Rose, after this date,

by a black line (Ward's *Marlow*, Appendix A, by Fleay, p. cxxxii, 2d edit., 1887). This inhibition was made before Sept. 25, 1593, when Henry Earl Derby died, during the plague, and was revoked in the middle of June, 1594. The instrument of permission is given in Collier's *Alleyn*, p. 36, undated, but it speaks of the restraint as made "not long since," a phrase quite inconsistent with Furness's statement (p. 279), that, "for some reason or other, possibly, as Collier suggests, while the Globe Theatre was building, the Lord Chamberlain's men did for two years, from June, 1594, to July, 1596, unite, or at least occupy the same theatre at Newington Butts, with the Lord Admiral's men." The Globe Theatre was built in 1599, not in 1594. There can be no reasonable doubt that the *Hamlet* acted at the theatre in 1595, as we learn from Lodge's allusion to it in 1596, was the same play as that acted by the Chamberlain's men in 1594 at Newington Butts, and acted by the same company. Malone's *Venetian Comedy* theory is obsolete: it was exploded when the acting of the Chamberlain's men at the Rose was disproved.

Thus far Fleay. But, responds Furness (p. 284), "Henslow expressly states that the performances were at Newington." On the contrary, answers Fleay, he expressly states that they only *began* there, with the Chamberlain's and Admiral's men, and were continued elsewhere, with what company is not stated; but may easily be ascertained to be the Admiral's by comparing the names of the plays with the subsequent lists. Henslow's words are, "*beginning* at Newington, my Lord Admiral and Lord Chamberlain's men," and then, after ten entries, comes the line of separation. Did it never occur to the believers in this myth that if the Chamberlain's men were with Henslow till 1596, entries of money account with some of them would certainly be found in this Diary?

Furness then makes a much more serious charge (p. 326). It seems that Fleay has identified the *Jud von Venedig* with Dekker's *Jew of Venice*, and with the *Venetian Comedy* (p. 331); that he has never read the *Jud*, and that in it are allusions which bring its date to 1605 at least. Fleay says the charges are complex and entangled, and that he must answer them *seriatim*. He denies the

identification of the *Venetian Comedy* with Dekker's play: his exact words were, "a Venetian comedy (perhaps a new version by Dekker of the *Jew of Venice*)," (Ward., p. cxxxi), and now, in consequence of an allusion to the *Venetian Comedy*, in Marstons *Insatiate Countess*, which implies quite a different kind of play, he wishes to withdraw even that conditional conjecture.

As to the date allusions, he admits their importance. The first is, according to Furness, an allusion in Silvan's *Orator*. "*The date of the Orator is 1596*," he says, in Italics. Not so, says Fleay, the date of Munday's translation of the *Orator* is 1596; but where is your proof that Munday's translation was used? Why should Dekker not have read the original? he was a good linguist: or, if you insist on a translation, why should he not have used the translation by E. A[ggas], entered S. R. 25, Aug., 1590? My date for the *Jew* is 1591: this fits in admirably. Ah, but there is also mentioned in the *Jud* a defeat of the Turks by the Sufi of Persia *lately*, and "Meissner notes that *this battle took place in August 1605*." Italics again. Really, says Fleay, does Meissner note that? and does he prove that that particular battle was alluded to? No doubt Meissner is a far better historical scholar than I, and yet he may not be aware that in England in 1591, when Murad III was preparing for his attack on Hungary in 1592, the disposition was to exaggerate the successes of the Persians, and that also, in the words of *The English Cyclopaedia* (article Abbas the Great), "The year 1590 was distinguished by victories in Gilan and Aserbijan over the Turks." Of course, after 1605, such an allusion, if made in 1591, could not fail to be intensified. But that any importance can be attached to such an argument surprises me.

Finally Fleay calls the attention of Furness to the fact that of the thirty plays in the list A. D. 1626, in which the *Jud von Venedig* occurs, ten have not been even conjecturally traced, but that the other twenty have been with great probability identified by him with English plays, and that in no one instance of those twenty can the date of production in England be proved to be later than 1591. (See *Life*, pp. 308-311 and especially Ward, p. cxxxii.) He now wishes to add

to what he has said before that *The Venetian Comedy* is not, but that the *French Doctor*, acted (but without the mark *n. e.*, *i. e.*, new enterlude) at the Rose by the Admiral's men, Oct. 19, 1594, probably is the same play as the *Jew of Venice* and the *Jud von Venedig*. He does not believe that Shakespeare's play was ever called the *Jew of Venice*, but thinks that Roberts inserted this title in his unauthorized application for leave to print the book, with the intention of misleading the licensers into a belief that it was Dekker's old play that was in question.

In summing up I beg to testify that I believe that Furness has been led to an entire misconception of Fleay's views through the incorrigible habit which possesses Fleay of not giving references to authorities on minor points, and especially to places where he has located the same questions elsewhere. If anything could cure him of this it would be his deep respect for Furness, and his great regret that he should by any fault of his have misguided him into so indefensible a position. Furness (p. 277) expresses his opinion so strongly that all such investigations are "barren," that no one can be surprised at his not working out his results with the same calm, steady perseverance which he has given to his *Æschylus* double-time theory. Fleay evidently believes that the order of a poet's works is an essential constituent of the grounds on which he should be criticised, and that the determination of the order is fruitful in the highest degree: he also believes Wilson's double time to be a fruitless delusion. Blessed is he that need only write on things in which he takes a vital interest.

---

#### A LIFE OF WOLSEY BY HIS GENTLEMAN USHER.

THE events of the life of Wolsey would be open to everybody who chose to make inquiry, subject to there being a large admixture of falsehood. The writer has "The Life and Death of Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal, etc., written by one of his own Servants, being his Gentleman Usher." The date is 1667, but is a reprint of a work published

evidently in the sixteenth century. As this is written from direct communication with the Cardinal, and not at second-hand, what he writes would be a very useful sedative in reading the stories told of many poets. He says :—

“They spread abroad innumerable lyes, without either shame or honesty ; which *prima facie* sheweth forth a visage of truth, as though it were an absolute verity, though indeed nothing less,” etc. Again :—

“I have heard, and also seen set forth in divers printed books, some untrue imaginations, after the death of divers persons (who in their lives, were in great estimation) invented rather to bring their honest names in question, than otherwise.”

All great names are liable to have garbage cast at them. Thus Dryden, who might have been expected to know better, says in his *Life of Virgil* :—

“Homer is said to be base-born, so is Virgil. The former to have been born in the open air, in a ditch, or on the bank of a river ; so the latter.” There are various other incidents related. Considering various places are assigned as the birthplace of “the former,” and that some hold he was never born at all, this is rather strong food, and might help those Baconians who are in search for facts for a *Life of Shakespeare*.

No doubt there are statements, copied from one to another, that Shakespeare’s father was a butcher ; but is there any real evidence of this ? It is also said Wolsey’s father was a butcher. The Gentleman Usher makes no mention of this. He says :—

“Truth is, Cardinal Wolsey was an honest poor man’s son in the town of Ipswich in the county of Suffolk, and there born, who being but a child was very apt to learn, wherefore by means of his parents, and other his good friends, he was maintained at the University of Oxford, where in a short time he prospered so well, that in a small time (as he told me with his own mouth) he was made Batchelour of Arts, when he was but fifteen years of age, and was most commonly called the Boy Batchelour.”

The fall of the Cardinal is attributed to the intrigues of Anne Bullen and her partisans.

*Bermondsey, England.*

GEORGE GOULD.

## Shakespeare Societies.

---

Such a holy witch  
That he enchants societies into him;  
Half all men's hearts are his.

---

*Cymbeline*, I, vi, 168.

CLIFTON SHAKSPEARE SOCIETY.—Bristol, England, Session 1887-'88, *October 1*.—Mr. John Taylor, President, in the chair.—At this meeting, the first of the thirteenth session, Mr. Taylor, the outgoing President, gave an address on "The Positive Evidence that Shakspeare wrote his own Plays." Mr. Taylor reviewed the contemporary allusions to Shakspeare, beginning with Greene and Chettle, and others, going on to Meres in 1598, and to many in the Reign of James I. With reference to the alleged authorship of Bacon, it was impossible to believe that the author of the "Novum Organum" could have written *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Bacon's genius was analytic; Shakspeare's was synthetic. Commentators agree that the author of the plays was altogether ignorant of the Greek language. Bacon's writings are saturated with Greek learning. The classical errors of name and characteristic which exist in the plays would have been impossible to Bacon. The first collected edition of the plays was published seven years after Shakspeare's death by Heminge and Condell, his personal friends, whose expressions in the dedication are so genuine that they must be accepted as trustworthy, and the idea of fraud must be completely set aside. Much other contemporary evidence was brought forward, all regarding Shakspeare as the unquestioned author of the plays. The parallelisms by which Mrs. Henry Pott seeks to support the theory would be fatal to the cause, so weak and strained are they. Many of these were cited in detail, and the Warwickshire allusions in the plays brought forward.—Mrs. C. I. Spencer was elected President for the session.

Oct. 22: Mrs. C. I. Spencer, President, in the chair.—*The Taming of the Shrew* was the play for consideration. A paper by Miss Louisa Mary Davies was read, entitled "A Ten Minutes' Twitter on Two Tender Topics." Miss Davies thought Katharina had been unfairly dealt with by author and critic. Her temperament had been misjudged by the terms applied to her from the beginning. She suffered from contact with her sister's lymphatic mood. A superhuman meekness places ordinary mortals at a horrible disadvantage. No lady of birth and education could patiently submit to such a wooing as that with which Petruchio opens his suit; and the systematic course of insult, mockery, and starvation to which he afterwards subjects her would not in real life attain the result given in the play, for since the world began no man ever won his wife's loving submission by treating her like a dangerous wild beast.—Mr. P. A. Daniel's "Time Analysis" of the play was read, and also a part of Mr. Albert R. Frey's recent paper on *The Taming of a Shrew* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. (SHAKESPEARIANA, June, 1887.)

Nov. 26: Mrs. C. I. Spencer, President, in the chair.—Mr. Walter Strachan read a paper on "Some of the 'Humours' in *Every Man in His Humour*," singling out for comment the following foibles of his day which Jonson intended to satirise: bombastic language, affected oaths, tobacco-smoking, the sport of hawking carried to excess, extravagance in dress. Some of these failings remain. One not even a royal tractate could extinguish. As one reads this comedy one feels that two and a half centuries have changed human nature but little. Some of the follies of 1616 have their counterparts in 1887 in a greater or it may be in a less degree. May we hope that we possess painters like "Rare Ben Jonson," who will depict the follies of their contemporaries, for the benefit of future generations, as well as he has done!

Dec. 17: Mr. John Williams in the chair.—A communication from the Vicar of Stratford-on-Avon was read, asking for funds towards the completion of the restoration of Shakspeare's church, and saying they must now largely depend upon contributions from outsiders, as



all the local available money had been collected. Mr. S. E. Bengough gave a communication upon "Some Baconianisms in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, bringing forward as evidence changes which had been made in the 1623 edition, through events which had happened to Bacon after 1602, the date of the first sketch of the play. Many of the instances from the *Promus* were also cited and commented on.

Jan. 28, 1888: Mr. J. H. Tucker in the chair.—Thomas, Lord Cromwell was the play for consideration. The Secretary read a portion of Mr. R. Simpson's paper on "The Political Use of the Stage in Shakspeare's Time" (*Transactions of New Shakspeare Society*, 1874, Part II). This was followed by an interesting discussion mainly on the historical incidents of the play.

Feb. 25: Mr. J. H. Tucker in the chair.—A paper by Mr. J. W. Mills was read, which consisted of "A Review of Mr. W. Watkiss Lloyd's Edition of *Much Ado About Nothing*." Mr. Lloyd's edition is described as being "now first published in fully recovered metrical form," and no part of it is printed as prose. Mr. Mills said that the book under review was another instance, in addition to many which he named, of the craving of this age for sensation and paradox. Mr. Lloyd says, "The distinctive and original feature of the projected, and indeed prepared, edition of Shakspeare, of which this play is a specimen, is the recovery and exhibition of the proper character of the speeches hitherto uniformly printed for pure prose, as being in truth metrical—composed by the poet in a very definite form of blank verse." This is asserted, but nothing worthy of the name of argument is brought forward to support it. Until these passages came upon Mr. Lloyd, no ear was ever fine enough to catch this "very definite form" of metre. The metre in question is quite superior to rules, which are what Mr. Lloyd calls "pedantic notions respecting versification"; and yet, with a blind inconsistency, he says that only "an ear for systematic metre" can discover this wildly irregular and totally unsystematic verse. According to Mr. Lloyd, the lines may consist of feet with "three, four, or even more syllables," and the only essential is that five of these syllables shall be accented. Yet no hint is given where these accents are to be placed in the most extraordinary

lines which Mr. Lloyd prints as verse. Not only is the ordinary reader unable to perceive these metrical lines, but poets from Pope to Tennyson, who have been Shakspeare students, have all missed that which so forcibly strikes Mr. Lloyd's ear. Mr. Mills gave some passages haphazard from "Quentin Durward" and "Bleak House," which could easily be turned into "Lloydian" verse. If the question as to what is, and what is not, metre is to be settled by each individual "ear," without intelligible rules, then the distinction between prose and verse must be utterly and forever abandoned; for there is not one single prose work in this or any other tongue that may not be printed and read as genuine poetry. Mr. Mills then, in detail, showed that the metrical license allowable in Latin comedy, to which Mr. Lloyd, at considerable length, directs attention, lies utterly outside the question at issue.—Mr. Walter Strachan read a paper on "Benedick," saying that the character had been subject to much misconception. Benedick was not a captious, sneering, cynical detractor of, and disbeliever in, what is good in human nature; but an honourable, kind-hearted, talented gentleman, who used his wit and his sarcasm to conceal his real thoughts and feelings.—Mr. G. Munro Smith read a paper on "Don Pedro," who is an interesting study, as showing, to some extent, Shakspeare's method of working; for he never "shirks" his characters, but, having the man in his mind's eye, he allows his qualities to appear without the least attempt to hide either the good or the bad. He does not present a batch of certain qualities. Don Pedro belongs to the class of disagreeable men. His sayings are frequently in bad taste, he is constantly showing his good opinion of himself, and his manners generally are nearly as bad as they can be. He is a man spoilt by his social position as prince, and Shakspeare very consistently draws him.—A paper by Miss Louisa Mary Davies was read, entitled "The Love-Affairs of a Wax-Doll." The parallelism between Charles Kingsley's description of a doll and Shakspeare's description of Hero is so close that it cannot escape observation. In connection with the episode at the masked ball, she tranquilly submits to a course of proceeding we can scarcely follow, even in imagination, so lowering does it seem to girlish dignity. This goes far to

warrant Claudio and the others in crediting the slander which is afterwards alleged against her. The extreme weakness of her nature is further shown by the imbecile way in which she meets the attack of Claudio in the church. Yet it does not seem quite right that she should have suffered so much for this weakness, and at last be handed over to an unstable, mistrustful, cowardly, coarse-minded bully.

---

## Miscellany.

---

To knit again

This scattered corn into one mutual sheaf.

—*Titus Andronicus*, V, 111, 70.

---

### CHARCOT ON SHAKESPEARE'S KNOWLEDGE OF SOMNAMBULISM.

—Professor Charcot, who is, as everybody knows, the greatest living specialist on hypnotism and kindred nervous affections, delivering a clinical lecture at the Salpêtrière, Paris, as reported in the *Medical News* of March 24th, gave the circle of students about him a statement of the case of the patient before them which, with its references to Shakespeare's deep observation of somnambulism probably needs no excuse to be cited somewhat fully here, as follows:—

Gentlemen: You have before you to-day the patient whom you saw three months ago; his history, a very interesting one, is as follows:

Man, thirty-seven years, porter by occupation. In March, 1887, he leaves his home at 8 A.M., suffering from headache, to carry a parcel to one of his master's customers, living about two miles from his home. He takes a car, and stops exactly before the person's house, and even remarks that the person has her address written on the door, but did not go in. . . . From this moment his remembrance disappears, he is absolutely in the dark. After having reached the house, the next fact he recollects faintly is that he was about four miles from the last place, where he had no business; the next recollection he has, is that he found himself on a bridge, about two miles away from the last place. Remark, he thinks he found himself there, but he is not certain. This is interesting to note, for the disease we think that man is suffering from, presents as a principal symp-

tom, amnesia. But this amnesia may not be complete, and certain vague remembrances might appear here and there.

From the moment the patient found himself on the bridge he walked continuously, until he awakened four miles from that place, at 10 P.M.; that is, he probably walked fourteen hours. He must have conducted himself as you and I; but he was not the less irresponsible and unconscious; and the only points that he remembers during these fourteen hours are, that he was four miles away from his first place of business, then on a bridge, and finally awakening in another part of the city at 10 P.M., where he found himself exhausted, and his boots all worn. He does not remember having taking breakfast, or having spent any money. After having awakened, he went home quietly, and when he reached his home he found himself covered with dust, but no trace of having fallen. The next day he did not feel overfatigued.

From the 15th of March to the 30th of July he worked steadily. On that day he was ordered to take a parcel to a customer. He took a car, and delivered perfectly well what he was charged to do. He then, being very near the place where the "900 feet Eiffel Tower" is being built, thought he would go and see the works. He remembers to have seen the statue of the tower, but from that moment he is again plunged in the dark. He remained two days and two nights without knowing what he did during that time; he finally threw himself into the river Seine, and awakened at that moment. During his sleep he bought a few cents worth of tobacco, entered a railroad station, took a ticket for Berry, deposited his money, took his change, received the ticket, and went into the train. While the train crossed the bridge over the river, he threw himself into the water.

A strange incident is the fact that his watch was at the correct time when he came to himself; he did not forget to wind it during this unconscious state. It is true, the same will occur to us. I often, when I retire, try to wind my watch over again, forgetting that I have already done it; he must have done it in a mechanical and unconscious way. . .

We find here a pathological phenomenon which deserves to be discussed. I have often asked myself what this singular state of unconsciousness could be, which would occasionally strike this person for hours, or even days. If we could prevent this man from going about cities without any object in view, it would be a great comfort to him. I have thought, and will try to justify it, that the affection from which he suffers is of epileptic origin; it is the ambulatory form of automatism, an expression which I use to characterize this situation of walking automatically, without any external appearance indicating this automatism. . . You will find many descriptions of this phenomenon in different works. If you want to read something interesting in this respect, I recommend you the paper of Mr. Jackson, of London, on the subject of ambulatory automatic fits, not accompanied by emotions, anger, or violence, and which have such an

analogy to the phenomenon of natural somnambulism, that it is questionable whether any difference in the symptoms can be established between these two groups of natural somnambulism and comital somnambulism. . . You know that in *Macbeth*, there is a very deep observation of somnambulism. The physician who is present, seeing Lady Macbeth rise and begin her somnambulatory acts, addresses himself to the other persons on the stage, and cries out, "See, her eyes are open!" This is the great question to know, whether the eyes are opened or closed in somnambulism. Our man must have had his eyes open, for he spoke to his employer and also took a railroad ticket. . . But you will say, Is it epileptic; is it not natural somnambulism? There are clinical differences, but there is a resemblance in the form. . . .

A few minutes ago I was mentioning a passage of Shakespeare, who has shown himself to be a very deep observer in medical subjects as in many other questions. He has given the same definition of natural somnambulism as Joseph Franck. This meeting of the poet and medical man is a curious one.

Shakespeare says, in *Macbeth*, to define the state of Lady Macbeth :

"A great perturbation in nature! to receive at once the benefit of sleep, and do the effects of watching."

What does Joseph Franck, the physician, say?

"Somnambulism is a perturbation of nature in which the patient has all the appearances of sleep, and yet does all the acts which are done when awake." . . . Shakespeare, in a *Macbeth* scene, says: "Her eyes are open." It is a very interesting observation, coming from a writer who is not a medical man; one might think he intended giving to the nosologists a lesson in pathology. He observed one of the principal symptoms of somnambulism, after giving a definition exactly similar to the one of Franck.

The somnambulist patient has his dream, his idea, he will do it, and will omit all which is not in his programme. If you place yourself before a patient in somnambulism, he will pass on the right or left side of you, not paying any attention to you, who are not present in his dream. It is said that Stuart Mill, while thinking of some philosophical subject, would often forget himself in the streets of London, not seeing the persons going by, absolutely a stranger to the outside world, and yet walking in a very natural manner; during that time he belonged absolutely to his mental education. It is a singular faculty not to see what does not interest you. And yet, if we examine ourselves, we find that not one of us has not gone up a stairs, arrived at a door, opened it, thinking of an entirely different subject. So it has been from the time of Hippocrates down to our days, we do not see our diseases, we are unable to see them. All the physicians have walked in the midst of locomotor ataxia down to the end of this century without seeing it; they have not seen multiple sclerosis; five years ago, I saw for the first time the hystero-traumatic paralysis.

To come back to the patient before you, to justify the diagnosis in these cases is always a difficult matter, on account of our superficial knowledge of the disease. . . The history of his family is a good one; no traces of nervous disturbance can be found. When a child he had no convulsions. . . I think after all the considerations I have unfolded to you, that we have to deal with a particularly remarkable case of comitial disease, or ambulatory automatism. It is the first time that I have seen an affection of this kind with such clearly pronounced symptoms, you will find no more interesting ones in your nosological descriptions. This man will continue his treatment, as he has done up to now. He will take 75 grains of bromide a day for a week, and then 80 grains for a week, the 105 grains the third week, and then over again; and he will report in three months from to-day.

ELIZABETHAN BOOKSELLERS.—Under the title "Bacon's Booksellers," which more properly designates the subject of the article, the London *Publishers' Circular* of May 15th gives a good deal of out-of-the-way information of general Elizabethan as well as of special Baconian interest, as follows:—

The imprint of a book is almost invariably an important and frequently an accurate guarantee of merit, and not only is this the case at the present moment, but something very analogous existed in times which have long since become merged in the dim obscurity of the past. In writing the literary account of a particular person or epoch, historians, almost without an exception, pass over in silence the part which booksellers played, and apparently consider it not only as beneath notice but as altogether superfluous. The essentially interwoven connection between bookselling and authorship has been so often pointed out in these pages, that it were perhaps a matter of supererogation to go over the ground again.

In 1597, Humfrey Hooper, whose shop was at the "blacke Beare in Chauncery Lane," brought out the first edition of *Bacon's Essays*. There were only ten subjects dealt with in this extremely quaint volume of thirty-two leaves (excepting the title-page and dedication). "To labour the staie of them," observes Bacon in the address to his brother, "had bin troublesome, and subject to interpretation; to let them passe had bene to aduerture the wrong the mought receiue by vntrue coppies, or by some garnishment, which it mought please any that should set them forth to bestow upon them." The second edition appeared in the following year, and, like the first, it bore the imprint of Hooper, who, from the very few examples of his publications now existing, we may assume was a young publisher whom Bacon wished to assist. In 1596 he had published Dr. John Wood's *Practica Medicinæ*. Editions of the *Essays* followed upon



one another with comparative rapidity, at least one appearing in 1604 and another in 1606, and then again in 1612 and 1624. Spedding doubted whether Bacon had anything to do with either of the issues of 1598, 1604, and 1606, which are said to be merely reprints without additions or alterations, except some changes in the spelling and the substitution of an English translation of the *Meditationes Sacre* from the original Latin. Whether John Beale's issue of 1606 was authorised or not we have no means of determining, but it is quite certain that Isaac Jaggard published pirated editions in 1606, 1612, and 1624. Jaggard's shop was at the sign of the "Hand and Starre, near Temple Bar, Fleet Street," and for a quarter of a century there were few more prolific booksellers than he. His publications include Carew's *Survey of Cornwall* (1602), Fairfax's translation of *Godfrey of Bulloigne* (1600), the first volume of an English version of Boccacio, and the famous first folio of Shakespeare (1623). In the last instance Blount, another bookseller, divided the undertaking, and in most other cases the pecuniary responsibilities were shared by friendly rivals. The first and only complete edition of the *Essays* published in Bacon's lifetime was printed by Hanna Barret and John Whittaker (1625), whose shop was at the sign of the King's Head in St. Paul's Churchyard. Hanna Barret was probably the widow of William Barret, who published several works—notably the productions of Montaigne, Bishop Hall, Sandys, and Bacon—between the years 1608 and 1624. Hanna Barret either retired from business or died in 1625, for we do not after that date meet with any examples of her publications.

"A Briefe Discourse, touching the Happie Union of the Kingdoms of England and Scotland" (1603), was printed for Fœlix Norton, whose shop was "at the signe of the Parot" in St. Paul's Churchyard, and were also to be sold by William Apsley. Apsley published books between 1599 and 1630, including the productions of Decker, Casaubon, Chapman, and Shakespeare. The year 1604 saw two more books of Bacon brought forth, each by a different bookseller. First, the "Certain Considerations touching the better pacification and edification of the Church of England," bore the *imprimatur* of Henrie Tomes—surely an appropriate surname for a bookseller!—and secondly, "Sir Francis Bacon: his Apologie," was entrusted to Matthew Lownes, whose shop was situated in that happy hunting-ground of booksellers, St. Paul's Churchyard. The first edition of the former book is described as excessively rare; and of Henry Tomes nothing more is known than that his shop was "over against Graies Inne Gate, in Holburne," and that he published some books between 1604 and 1607, the most interesting and curious of which is, perhaps, "The Commendation of Cocks and Cock-fighting, wherein is shewn that cock-fighting was before the coming of Christ" (black letter, 1607). Matthew Lownes sold many books, often in conjunction with Isaac Jaggard, from 1596 to 1625; he was the son of Hugh Lownes of Rode, in Astbury, Cheshire, and was born



about 1568. He died probably in 1625, in which year his widow gave £10 to the Stationers' Company as a remembrance of the departed Matthew.

The *Advancement of Learning*, or, as it was first called, "The Two Bookes of Francis Bacon, of the proficiencie and advancement of Learning, divine and humane," 1605, was also printed for Tomes. The first part consists of 45 leaves, and the second of 118; as was then sometimes the custom, each leaf had only one number instead of two as at the present time. An edition of this book was printed in 1629 for W. Washington, and another in 1633 for T. Huggins, of Oxford, neither of whom was particularly noted as a bookseller.

*De Sapientia Veterum*, better known as the "Wisdom of the Ancients" (1609), a very carefully and beautifully printed little duodecimo, was produced by Robert Barker, who enjoyed the honour of being His Majesty's printer, who was granted, on July 19, 1603, a special license for printing all statutes, and who, moreover, was one of a large family of printers. A translation of *De Sapientia Veterum* was printed in 1619 for John Bill, who, from 1604 to 1630, had something more or less to do with a great number of books, and whose assigns continued in business until 1642. In addition to this, John Bill was the "sponsor" of Bacon's greatest work, viz., the *Instauratio Magna*, which appeared in folio during 1620. This book embodied an attempt to build up a new philosophy, and, as the *Novum Organum* is but one part of a stupendous whole, and is therefore only a fragment, yet it is the most carefully written of all Bacon's philosophical works. In 1622, the *Historia Ventorum*—the first published part of the *Historia Naturalis*, which was to be the third division of the *Instauratio*—was printed for Matthew Lownes and William Barret; and in the following year the *Historia Vitæ et Mortis* was printed for Lownes solely, to both of whom reference has already been made. The *History of the Reign of Henry VII* was another of Bacon's works that came out in 1622, in folio, and this, like the *Historia Ventorum*, was printed for Lownes and William Barret.

Bacon's *Translation of certaine Psalmes into English Verse*, a quarto of 22 pages, or 11 leaves, and dedicated to Herbert, of "The Temple" fame, appeared during the year 1625, under the auspices of Hanna Barret and Richard Whittaker, as did also, in the same year, the "Apophthegmes, new and old."

William Lee, of the Turk's Head, Fleet Street, appears to have obtained the right of publishing *Sylva Sylvarum* in perpetuity, for not only does the first edition (1627) bear his name, but the fifth of 1639, and the seventh of 1658. In 1629 appeared the *Advertisement Touching an Holy Warre*, which, although written seven years previously, came forth with the name of Humphrey Robinson; and the next year the "Assigns of John More, Esq.," published *The Elements of Common Law*. Robinson, whose shop was at the "Signe of the Three Pidgeons, in Paul's Churchyard," issued,

*inter alia*, the first edition of Milton's *Comus* in 1637, under the somewhat windy title of "A Maske, presented at Ludlowe Castle, on Michaelmas night, before the Right Honourable John, Earle of Bridgewater, Viscount Brackley, Lord President of Wales, and one of His Majestie's most Honourable Privie Counsell." Thirty-four years after this—*i.e.*, in 1671—"Young Mr. Robinson gave £10 to the Company of Stationers to be bestowed on a piece of plate in memory of his father. A silver tankard was purchased, weight 34 ounces 10 pennyweights." That Bacon's *Elements of Common Law* should be published by John More, or rather by his assigns, is only right and proper, for on March 2, 1642, the "Patent first granted to Richard Tottle" was on or about that date "confirmed to John More, for the sole printing of all law books whatsoever, prohibiting all others from printing them." In 1641 the assigns of the same person printed and published Bacon's *Cases of Treason*, which was to be purchased at the shops of Matthew Walbancke and William Coke, both very minor booksellers, of whom scarcely anything is known.

GARRICK'S SHAKESPEARE COMMEMORATION.—Shortly after the erection of the new Town Hall at Stratford-on-Avon by the Corporation, in 1768, George Alexander Steevens, the well-known critic, and several friends spent a pleasant evening at the White Lion Hotel, when Mr. John Payton, the landlord, suggested that a statue of Shakespeare ought to occupy the vacant niche on the north front of the municipal structure. This suggestion found favor, and Steevens, impressed with the idea of getting up a gala to commemorate the unveiling, communicated the scheme to David Garrick, and asked the great actor to assist in promoting a festival in honor of the poet's natal day, also to give a benefit at Drury-Lane to defray the expenses. Garrick approved of the scheme, and ultimately a correspondence ensued between the Town Council and Garrick, whose offers gave so much satisfaction, that on May 6th, 1769, Garrick was invited to the ancient Warwickshire borough, and the freedom of the place, enclosed in a handsome casket, made out of the trunk of the mulberry tree taken from Shakespeare's garden at New Place, was formally presented to the famous tragedian by the Mayor of Stratford. Garrick was likewise unanimously appointed steward of the festival, which took place on September 6th, 7th, and 8th, 1769. A monster marquee, termed Shakespeare's Hall, was erected after the fashion of the Rotunda at Ranelagh Gardens. This was supported by a colonnade

of Corinthian design, ten feet from the sides; from the centre of the roof hung a chandelier containing 800 oil lamps. The other decorations were most unique. The oratorio of "Judith" was sung, after which a masked ball took place, the town was illuminated, the interest in the proceedings being augmented by the recital of an original ode written and delivered by Garrick. The dramatic entertainment consisted of a comedy, entitled "The Stratford Jubilee," written by Mr. Francis Gentleman, and a piece termed "Scrubs' Trip to the Jubilee," the prologue being spoken by Tom Weston, from which the annexed couplets will show that though there were many thousands present, the clerk of the weather contrived to damp the ardor of the procession entirely, which Weston, in subsequently detailing the circumstances at Drury-Lane, affirmed—

Would have been a fine train  
But could not move forward "o' la" for the rain.  
Such tragical, comical folks and so fine,  
What a pity it was that the sun didn't shine,  
Since ladies, and baronets, aldermen, squires,  
All went to the jubilee, full of desires.  
I drank too, and now I a poet may be,  
From a charming fine cup of the mulberry tree.

Thomas King delivered Garrick's prologue to Mr. Gentleman's comedy in the garb of a waiter. King enjoyed more of Garrick's friendship than any other actor, and retained his position for fifty-four years as a comedian, while Tom Weston was one of Dame Nature's wonders, being endowed with marvellously felicitous gifts, by which he threw the spectators into roars of laughter without discomposing a muscle of his features. When the "Trip to the Jubilee" was transplanted to Drury Lane, Weston played in it ninety-two nights.

The procession which was to have taken place was marred by the continual downpour of rain that fell during the day, and obliged crowds of visitants to stay at the public-houses. The ode given by Garrick was as follows:—

Thou soft-flowing Avon, by thy silver stream,  
Of things more than mortal sweet Shakespeare would dream,  
The fairies by moonlight dance round his green bed  
For hallow'd the turf is which pillow'd his head.

The love-stricken maiden, the soft-sighing swain,  
 Here rove without danger and sigh without pain,  
 The sweet bud of beauty no blight shall e'er dread,  
 For hallow'd the turf is which pillow'd his head.

Here youth shall be fam'd for their love and their truth,  
 And cheerful old age feel the spirit of youth;  
 For the raptures of fancy there poets shall tread,  
 For hallowed the turf is which pillow'd his head.

Flow on silver Avon, in song ever flow,  
 Be the swans on thy waters whiter than snow,  
 Ever full be thy stream, like his name may it spread,  
 And the turf ever-hallowed which pillow'd his head.

Garrick was also presented with a goblet formed from the same precious wood that was bought by Sharpe, the turner, when Gastrell sold the mulberry trees he had caused to be hewn down at New Place. The cup was filled with mulberry wine, of which the actor drank, and then spoke the lines composed by himself for the occasion:—

Behold, this fair goblet

(*Garrick elevated the cup as he spoke above his head*)

'twas carved from the tree

Which, O my sweet Shakespeare, was planted by thee.

As a relic I kiss it, and bow at the shrine;

What comes from thy hand must be ever divine.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree,

Bend to thee, blest mulberry;

Matchless was he who planted thee,

And thou, like him, immortal shall be.

Ye trees of the forest so rampant and high,

Who spread wide your branches, whose heads sweep the sky,

Ye curious exotics, whom taste has brought here,

To root out the natives, at prices so dear.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

The oak so held royal is Britain's great boast,

Preserved once our King, and will always our coast.

But of fir we make ships, we have thousands that fight

While one, only one, like our Shakespeare can write.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

Let Venus delight in gay myrtle bowers,

Pomona in fruit trees, and Flora in flowers;

The garden of Shakespeare all fancies will suit,  
With the sweetest of flowers and the finest of fruit.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

With learning and knowledge the well-lettered birch  
Supplies law and physic and grace for the church,  
But law and the Gospel in Shakespeare we find,  
And he gives the best physic for body and mind.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

The fame of the patron gives fame to the tree,  
From him and his merits this takes a degree ;  
Let Phoebus and Bacchus their glories resign,  
Our tree shall surpass both the laurel and vine.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

The genius of Shakespeare outshines one bright day,  
More rapture than wine to the heart can convey,  
So the tree that he planted by making his own  
Has the laurel and bays and the vine all in one.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

Then each take a relic of this hallow'd tree,  
From folly and fashion a charm let it be ;  
Fill, fill to the planter the cup to the brim,  
To honor the country, do honor to him.

All shall yield to the mulberry tree, etc.

The relics from Stratford were sold by auction on the death of Mrs. Garrick. It was contemplated to hold a festival yearly, but owing to lack of support the movement was abandoned, as was Edmond Malone's movement for a commemoration in 1794, through public interest being centred in the disasters consequent on the French Revolution.

H. C. PORTER in Stratford *Herald*.